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ABSTRACT
Dealing with heretofore unresolved questions regarding the Genesis record and the Creationist's Models there is an attempt to provide a current and coherent model of natural and biblical history. I have titled this monograph "A New Look at Genesis". The stress will be on the normative hermeneutic [37] with some special insights into Scriptural exegesis with scientific, i.e. natural history, coherency.

Created elements which are shown to be finite, complete, and everywhere present are seen to only fit a creation scenario. A system that is biologically totally interdependent is seen to demand a creation where nothing works until everything works. The biblical sequence and time limit on the creative effort is presented. The scientific evidence for the elimination of a "Big Bang" hypothesis is given, and a supernaturally stretched out universe as defined by Scripture, and fitting an inflationary scenario should provide some new insights into the starlight and time questions associated with a young universe and a six 24 hour day creation.

A pre-Flood scenario is described that fits the biblical record and correlates with the current thinking of many geologists and paleontologists. The model fits a Pangea like Gondwana/Laurasia correlation with Cush and Havileh [Gen. 2:10-13]. The model is consistent with a world wide tropical environment, and describes an atmosphere and environment which is consistent with long life, gigantism, dinosaurs, heavy flying mammals, and many other aspects of that world that perished.

In this unique study of modern science and biblical exegesis it is hoped that a coherent picture of natural history and the Genesis record will be brought forth that will spur both the creation scientist and the secular scientist to progress toward a better understanding of The Truth and the natural history of the world.

INTRODUCTION
It was said at the 1994 International Conference on Creationism that the most fundamental need within the scientific community of believers is the proper development of a "coherent model" of natural and biblical history. A coherent model approach was initially attempted with the publishing of The Genesis Flood, a book by Doctor's Henry Morris and John Whitcomb written in 1961. This
book represented the first systematic presentation of the creation model of origins, especially from a geological framework. Since that time, a large amount of new scientific information has become available in the fields of not only geology but archaeology, astronomy, biology, genetics, linguistics, and physics, which together with the great advances in computer technology now afford us the ability to assimilate, correlate, and analyze these data to the end that much better models can be constructed regarding the natural history of this world. It is the goal of this study to draw together these data around a new look at the biblical framework of history to see where they do or do not fit. With coherency comes the need to be somewhat comprehensive, and hence I have tried to address most of the major scenarios of Genesis 1-11 [Presented in two papers: Gen. 1-5 & Gen. 6-11].

As in all good science not all that is presented can be said to be absolute, but in most scenarios it should be seen as certainly plausible. Dealing with many heretofore unresolved questions regarding the Genesis record, we have presented scenarios that are coherent and in some cases new, hence the title "A New Look at Genesis". This monograph is an attempt, within a normative hermeneutic, to provoke both thinking and new research within the creationist community.

THE CREATION

Biblical Record

The Scripture declares that God spoke the material universe, the heavens and the Earth, into existence [Ps. 33:6] and stretched out the heavens in a time past which fits within the first four days of a six twenty four hour period of Creation. A brief examination of the biblical texts will show that this is a valid, normative interpretation on what God did to spread the universe out to its present configuration. It will also be seen that an expanding universe beyond the time constraints of the first four days is neither biblical or scientifically correct.

The Scripture tells us of a creation of matter in the heavens and the Earth on the first day and energizing that matter with the creation of light shortly thereafter [Gen. 1:1-5]. This first day is described as a literal 24 hour day with evening and morning. In addition the Hebrew word for day [yom] is preceded by a number which always indicates a singular 24 hour day, such as we now experience [Gen. 1:5]. The Hebrews to this day celebrate the six day creation and the seventh day of rest for a sign [Hebrew aoth] to the world that this is the proper interpretation [Ex. 31:16,17]. Since there is also night and the light is not uncreated the mechanism for day and night, i.e. rotation of the Earth, must be started. Apparently the elements which comprise the entirety of the universe, i.e. the same elements are found everywhere we look, underwent transformation up through the fourth day since the lights which are the current source for the lights we now see are not said to be in the "firmament of the heavens to divide the day from the night" until the fourth day [Gen. 1:14]. This four day transformation involves the firmament and the waters on the second day [Gen. 1:6-8], and the atmosphere, the dry land and the seas on the third day [Gen. 1:9,10]. God follows his preparation of the land with the creation of the earth's flora still working on the third day [Gen. 1:11-13]. It should be noted that much of this flora can not propagate nor survive until the Fauna of the fifth and sixth days are present, a fact which was clearly proved by the recent "Biosphere 2" project [36]. With this scenario in focus we need to examine the rest of Scripture to complete the picture of God's work in the heavens.

The biblical texts regarding the stretching out of the heavens do not allow accommodation of the "Big Bang" theory of evolutionary cosmology or a continually expanding universe. They do allow a short period of time within the creation week. The statement that God stretched out the heavens occurs eleven times in the Bible [Job 9:8,26;7,13; Ps. 104:2; Isa. 40:22; 42:5; 44:24; 45:12; 51:13; Jer. 10:12; 51:15; Zech. 12:1], and should always be seen as a completed event. The word translated stretched or stretches either occurs in the Qal preterite or participle form [41, p.810,811] These grammatical forms demand the interpretation of a process which is a past event. One verse is of particular interest that being Job 26:7. Here the word translated stretched out [Heb. noteh] is said to have been done over emptiness. The word emptiness [Heb. tohu] also shows up in Gen. 1:2 and describes the earth on the first days when habitation was not possible.
and not yet accomplished. For a study of the word *tohu* see Morris's Genesis Record [27], and Lang's commentary on Job [23]. This would put the event in the time when the world was uninhabited, which was true at least through the fourth day. Furthermore, the context surrounding these eleven statements almost always implies an accomplished event, and not an ongoing process. For example, in Isaiah 45:12 God puts the creation of the earth, the creation of man upon it, the stretching and ordaining of the heavenly host, all in the same past time era.

**Scientific Evidence**

**Created Matter - The Elements:**

With the synthesizing of elements heavier than U - 235, it soon became clear why uranium is the heaviest stable element, and why we now know that the all the elements are complete and finite. The Periodic Table of the elements shows the atomic numbers, i.e. the number of protons in any given element, to be complete without any missing numbers from one to now 112. Both the theory and experimental results show a rapidly decreasing half life of all elements above U - 235 which are approaching an infinitely small time of existence with no possibility of any more stable elements existing. The theoretical explanation of this is based on the understanding of the nuclear mass attraction of the proton and the neutron in the nuclei which is expressed as the energy of binding. This energy of binding is the equivalent of the total mass of all the protons and neutrons, less the actual nuclear mass. As the number of neutrons increases more and more with respect to the number of protons in the nucleus [e.g. Helium has 2 protons and 2 neutrons whereas Uranium has 92 protons and 143 neutrons], the imbalance increases until only α-unstable nuclei are possible. The ordered variation of this binding energy as it varies with atomic mass number, just as it was designed to do, limits the number of elements on the heavy side of the table. On the lower side, Hydrogen, the "anomalous" element as it is often called, is the basic starting point [i.e. breakdown of the proton, which is the nucleus of Hydrogen, leads only to unstable subatomic particles].

In conclusion, the Periodic Table, shows a limited number of stable elements, i.e.92, and another 20 which can be synthesized in small quantities by modern methods of nuclear physics. The observer will note that there are no holes in the table. Furthermore, the 24 elements at the higher atomic numbers are all radioactive [which means they spontaneously change or decay into lower level elements]. Beyond element 112 the theory and experimental data show an almost infinitely short existence where chemists and physicists do not expect to find any new elements. A scientist will not say that the discovery of a new element is impossible. He simply says that the probability of finding such an element is extremely low on the order of one chance in a trillion trillion [1/10^24]. To find one would destroy the foundations of the Periodic Table, and it would make some scientists skeptical about the presence of law and order in the universe.

Throughout the universe we find all matter is the same as we are able to study the complete radiation spectrum of the stars, galaxies, and other extra terrestrial phenomena. With this truth in view no theory of evolution can be formed to account for the similarity, periodicity, and finite limit of all elements because evolution implies continuous change. If, as the evolutionists propose, all matter in the universe began as hydrogen which then evolved into its present complexity by chance combination in that long history of stars, galaxies, planets, and eventually life why is the table of elements, i.e. all known matter in the universe, a closed end entity and not some infinite combination of basic building blocks capable of any combination and eventually evolving into higher and higher orders of existence?

The evolutionist W.A. Fowler writing in 1956 on "The Origin of the Elements" in Scientific American, developed a model whereby the stars are fueled "by the fusion of hydrogen with helium" and postulated that as hydrogen is exhausted, the core contracts gravitationally and grows hotter until a new fusion reaction is initiated, turning helium into carbon. As the stars progressed through their evolutionary phases it was postulated that the elements from carbon to iron were formed in this manner. Iron is the last element in this sequence since all fusion reactions involving iron or higher order elements absorb energy rather than release it. Therefore, all elements heavier than iron were formed in the evolutionary scenario by the capture of bombarding neutrons. Don't the evolutionists know or understand that according to the first and
second law of thermodynamics that there is no such thing as outside source of spontaneous energy which their scenario needs to form higher order elements. If no external energy is continually available from some outside source, and remember that the evolutionary model starts with only hydrogen, or some might say only hydrogen and helium, and no radioactive elements were in existence prior to that time, how can they have the spontaneous formation of elements from iron on up the table of elements if all these events must be initiated by some outside force possessing energy, be it radioactive elements, laser beams, or some other form of radiation, e.g. light? The big bang theory, which has many scientific arguments against it in many scientific circles today [4, 25, 29 et al], was argued to be the energy trigger, but the evolutionary scientists will have to come up with some other initiation scheme since energy can not create itself. It is much more reasonable to see a creator of light, i.e. God, giving us the energy and the atoms in the universe simultaneously, in perfect balance and in periodic order according to the known laws of science. Also, we might ask where did the first proton come from which was energized with an electron mate to give us hydrogen? The evolutionist will say that the elements are eternal; but, as we can see, they truly don't understand the elements or the fundamental particles and their relation to one another [i.e. the laws that govern them]. The four forces in the atom, [i.e. nuclear, electromagnetic, gravity, and nuclear interactive] are in delicate balance, and all exhibit rigid and predictable laws that indicate order and design rather than randomness and chaos. This balance yields a periodic relationship of all elements, which, as we have seen, only fits a creation model of a finite universe.

We can affirm what the Scripture says of the one who is "the image of the invisible God and first born all creation; for by Him were all things created, ... by Him, and for Him, and He is before all things, and in Him all things consist" [Col. 1:15-17]. Furthermore, if physicist Leon Lederman, author of The God Particle [24], wants a T-shirt that will state the fundamental principle, I suggest it have the principle "In the beginning God created the elements out of nothing" written on the shirt.

Biosphere 2: Nothing works until everything works!

This topic is dealt with next because in the creation week the flora was created on the third day before the Son, Moon and stars were placed in the heavens to sustain light.

After an ecological catastrophe brought the ambitious experiment called "Biosphere 2" to its demise, you would think that some of the evolutionists that conceived the project would start to question their hypothesis that chance and time, or even intelligent man, could construct a biosphere to replicate Earth's complex, large scale ecological process. William C. Harris of Columbia University commented on their failure by stating that, "It's pretty hard to play God and run all the things on the planet" [36, p. 58].

First of all let's look at what went wrong:
1. Microbes in the highly enriched garden soil consumed more oxygen than expected, reducing the atmospheric oxygen concentration from 21 percent to 14 percent.
2. Atmospheric carbon dioxide combined with calcium carbonate. This sequestering of carbon dioxide added to the difficulty in determining what was happening to Biosphere's atmosphere.
3. Most vertebrate and insect species went extinct, including all the pollinators, leaving flowering plants with no way to reproduce.
4. Populations of "crazy ants" and cockroaches exploded, and morning glory vines overran other plants.
5. The crew suffered from food shortages, which eventually led to weight losses and infighting.

The problems with the atmosphere should tell us how intricately the Earth's atmosphere is designed and balanced to sustain life. No evolutionary scenario can possibly explain the interdependence shown to be necessary and all in place at one time to maintain any of the ecosystems on this planet. The mass of the planet which holds our atmosphere, the distance from the sun, the moon's existence and location, all need to be in perfect balance to sustain the atmosphere and even the simplest living organisms.
The flowering plants could not reproduce without the pollinating vertebrates and insects. This fact denies the so called "geological column" based order of evolution, which states that long periods of time occurred from the time the plants evolved until the pollinating insects and birds evolved.

Finally, as food became short some crew members suggested "plowing under the savanna wilderness to create more farmland." Infighting became the order of the day. The false highmindedness of the environmentalists who want to save the planet and inhabit other planets will quickly deteriorate into self centeredness and war as the Earth approaches its final days prior to the imminent return of its maker.

The evidence is clearly in favor of an intelligently designed planet with all systems mature and in place essentially at once because there is a minimum functional complexity and interdependence necessary in living systems as well as spatial systems and it is very true that nothing works until everything works.

The Heavens:

Structures have been found lately that are larger than anything the astronomers have predicted and it would be profitable to just review what we know of the universe at this time.

We will start with the nearby and progress to the outermost. First of all there is the solar system in which the earth is uniquely placed to support life as we know it. The diameter of the known solar system is about 80 astronomical units [1 AU = the distance from the Earth to the Sun = 93 million mi.] Within 10 light years [One light year at the current speed of light = 63,000 AU = 5,878,000,000,000 mi.] there are about 30 stars. These are our near neighbors and the distances are all derived from trigonometric parallax. Next comes our galaxy which is called the Milky Way. The distance across the Milky Way is about 100,000 light years and this estimate of distance, as are all further distances, is based on the indirect methods of measurement. The Milky Way belongs to a local group of galaxies which include in it the Andromeda galaxy. Some galaxies are spirals, some elliptical, and some are irregular. The distance across this local group is estimated to be about 4 million light years. The larger group of galaxies of which our local group is a part is the Virgo Super Cluster. This Super Cluster, which is now estimated to be smaller than most is 60 million light years across.

In 1989 Margaret J. Geller and John P. Huchra of the Harvard Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics discovered something much larger than the Virgo Super Cluster. It was North of the Milky Way and it was estimated to measure 500 million light years across. They called it the "Great Galactic Wall" [15,16]. According to their estimates, the wall is so large and so massive that it could not have been built by gravitational attraction during the 18 billion year evolutionary age of the universe.

In 1990 a structure was found that is over ten times larger. David Koo of the Univ of California, Alexander Szalay of Johns Hopkins Univ., and Richard Kron and Jeffrey Munn of the University of Chicago surveyed the North Galactic Pole from Kitt Peak National Observatory in Arizona. Thomas Broadhurst and Richard Ellis of the University of Durham did a similar survey of the South Galactic Pole from the Anglo Australian Observatory in Australia [7]. These astronomers found that when they charted the hundreds of galaxies that had been measured, they discovered that they were organized in clumps. The Super Clusters appear at regular intervals about 400 [some say 200] million light years apart. Each clump contains the same density of galaxies. There are seven clumps including the great wall to the North and seven to the South. Koo suspects that we may be seeing a whole series of "Great Walls" and that when all directions are mapped, that we may be inside a series of bubbles or shells.

For the philosophical naturalist, it will take a lot of hard work to explain how the universe could generate these great massive clumps. The evidence that the universe could be structured so well at such vast distances is a major stumbling block to the "Big Bang" theory. Stephen Hawking commenting on the missing mass required to pull this structured system together after a "Big
"Big Bang" stated that: "Either we have failed to see 99% of the universe, or we are wrong about how the universe began".

Today the most widely accepted hypothesis as to the origin of the universe and everything in it is the evolutionary cosmology theory called the "Big Bang". It is almost universally spoken of as an established fact in popular science journals and scholarly papers alike [4].

The expansion of the universe is primarily based on the interpretation of the red shift seen in the spectral analysis of stellar light. A tremendous amount of data has been gathered on the red shift phenomenon since the first measurements were taken in 1912. Although a minority of galaxies manifest a blue shift [e.g. Andromeda], it is accepted by most astronomers that this minority can be explained without doing harm to the hypothesis that the entire universe is expanding. It should be pointed out to these astronomers that not looking the exception, even when the exception is almost at the limits of one's measuring devices, is what led Kepler to solving the puzzle of elliptical orbits, as opposed to the then majority view that the planets were in circular orbit.

The first question we need to ask with regard to this hypothesis is whether the red shift of the spectral lines is actually indicating a relative velocity of these stars from the observer on earth. The second question is what about the several significant anomalies such as the blue shifted galaxies and the apparent dichotomy of the data from Quasars. A minority of scientist have concluded that the red shift measurements of galaxies alone do not prove an expanding universe because other equally valid explanations exist for them [35]. These explanations fall into three catagories: First of all, the most straight forward is that we are looking at a perfectly ordered system set in relative motion with some stars moving towards us and others moving away, hence accomodating the anomalies of blue shifts and Quasars. The August 1992 Sky and Telescope reports on the findings of William G. Tifft of the University of Arizona. He has been examining lists of red shifts from distant galaxies. Before plotting the red shifts on a graph, he corrects them for the effects of the Earth's motion. If the red shifts from these objects are the results of their speeding away from Earth, their red shifts should be evenly spread over the range of known red shifts. Tifft found that this is not the case. The red shifts are clumped in patterns at intervals of about 72 kilometers per second, with some half that value, and some one third. Astronomers were skeptical so a team from the Royal Observatory in Edinburgh refigured the values, but they came up with the same results. Tifft also did a second study of the data which shocked astronomers. He published findings in the December 1, 1991, Astrophysical Journal, that show that galaxy red shifts measured from Earth have changed during the years they have been observed. This change is completely unexplainable by the proponents of the Big Bang theory. Researchers say that the change in red shifts is real and large enough that Tifft expects to test the rate at which these changes take place within only a few years. This is exactly what we would expect if we are looking at an ordered universe set in relative motion with fixed rates of change in relative velocity and some moving away and some moving towards us. Secondly, another explanation for the red shift is that it does not indicate relative velocity at all but is caused by a loss of energy as light photons travel the vast expanse of space. Thirdly, there is the possibility that the red shift is a gravitational effect caused by the varying densities of the source. It is clear from Einsteins theory of general relativity that light is influenced by gravity, a phenomena which was verified experimentally in 1919 by Born [6], and again in 1976 by Irwin Shapiro and his colleagues at M.I.T. working with radio signals between the Viking spacecraft on Mars and antennas on Earth. According to the theory of general relativity, the spectrum of light from a source located at a distance R from a mass M will suffer a gravitational red shift z when detected by a distant observer such that \( z = GM/c^2 \), where G is the gravitational constant, and c is the speed of light. Therefore, with gravity altering the electromagnetic signal which is light, the more dense the source, the greater a red shift. This is, in fact, what would happen if the source were as dense as a black hole, the light would not escape at all. This would also allow for the anomalies of blue shifted galaxies and Quasars.

This brings us naturally to a discussion of Quasars. Quasars are the most luminous objects in the universe, some of them having luminosities more than 100 times greater than the brightest known galaxy. Beginning in the early sixties with the growth of radio astronomy more than 250 Quasi-Stellar objects have now been determined. Some Quasars discovered since the mid-1980s have a z of more than 4 which astronomers assumed would make them the most distant objects yet
found in the universe (a z of 4 means that the spectral lines are shifted to wavelengths 4 times greater than normal, implying their relative velocity moving away from the Earth is 93 percent of the speed of light). Halton Arp, a graduate of Harvard and once considered the world’s leading expert on Quasars as a practicing astronomer at CalTech and Mt. Palomar Observatory, disagrees with the position of Quasars on the outer edge of the universe [2, pp.13,45], and therefore disagrees with the interpretation of red shift as recessive velocity. Arp's data shows the following:

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Galaxy</th>
<th>Redshift [z]</th>
<th>Distance [arcsec] from G to Q</th>
<th>Quasar</th>
<th>Redshift [z]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NGC622</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>UB1</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>BS01</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGC 470</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>68D</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGC 1073</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>BS01</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>BS02</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>RSO</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGC 3842</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>QSO1</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>QSO2</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>QSO3</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGC 4319</td>
<td>0.0056</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Mk. 205</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCG 03-34</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>PKS 1327-206</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGC 5296</td>
<td>0.0083</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>BSO#1</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C 303</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>UV#C</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC 2402</td>
<td>0.0667</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0844+31</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ref. [2, pp.13,45]

Note that the redshift of the Quasars is many orders of magnitude greater than that of the galaxies which are in close proximity to them. Another argument from physics says that Arp is right about the location of these Quasars. This argument stems from the fact that if the QUASARS are as far away as Hubble’s Law would indicate their luminosity has to be so great that no known physical phenomena can account for it [39]. The most distant Quasar according to the Hubble relationship is in excess of fifteen billion light years away. The calculated energy to produce the measured luminosity of this Quasar would have to be at least three orders of magnitude greater than our sun if the distance is as great as the Hubble relationship indicates.

Table 2 presents large discordant redshifts of stellar objects [not QUASARS] within or connected to the same galaxies.
Table 2
Connected or Interacting Galaxies with Large Discordant Redshifts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Galaxy</th>
<th>Companion</th>
<th>Excess Redshift [km/sec]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NGC 7603</td>
<td>Comp SE</td>
<td>8,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM0059-402</td>
<td>Comp S</td>
<td>9,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM0213-283</td>
<td>Comp N</td>
<td>9,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM0328-222</td>
<td>Comp S</td>
<td>17,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM2006-295</td>
<td>KN SW</td>
<td>22,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGC 1232</td>
<td>Gal B</td>
<td>26,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGC 53</td>
<td>Comp N</td>
<td>32,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM2054-221</td>
<td>Comp E</td>
<td>36,460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ref. [2, p. 86]

These data clearly show that stellar objects in the same galactic formation have redshift differences large enough to question the validity of any direct relationship between distance from the earth and the redshift value. Take for example galaxy NGC 1232 whose main galaxy has a red shift of 1,776 km/sec yet has at the same distance in its disk galaxy B with a redshift of almost 28,000 km/sec hence an excess redshift of 26,210 as indicated. Arp showed from his fifteen year field research on Quasars, that the Quasars with their enormous red shift were not distant anomalies at the outer limits of cosmic space but were bodies within our own galactic neighborhood. The evidence that Arp discovered of course is at odds with the red shift hypothesis which underlies the Big Bang theory, namely that the galaxies distance and the velocity of its recession are compatible with Hubble's equation. Hubble's equation is \( v = Hr \) where \( r \) is the distance in megaparsecs and \( v \) is the velocity in km/sec. \( H \) is Hubble's constant which it should be noted has varied over the years from 1 to 100 with the best estimate as of 1995 of 50 with a variance of + or - 7. With the new Hubble Space Telescope data obtained in 1995 they have again revised this so called constant to 80 with an order of magnitude change downward in the age of the universe, i.e. it went from 18 billion years down to 9 [11]. Needless to say the majority of the astronomical community knew their pet theory was in serious trouble and if Arp was correct the Hubble Law is no law at all. Arp was first given a chance to change his conclusions, and if he refused he was openly told that he would be denied all telescope time. Today Arp is an astronomer in exile in West Germany, unwelcome at Palomar and all the world's other major observatories as well [21,p.22,94.] . It should be noted that the Quasar data is consistent with an ordered universe with various stellar objects traveling at various velocities in whatever proximity they have been placed just like our own solar system. More recently Dr. Arp in his work at the Max Planck Institute has presented further proof that the red shift is not an indication of an expanding universe and some scientists are finally saying "the implications are as revolutionary as Galileo's claims" [32].

For the past decade the Big Bang theory has come under attack from the scientific community itself. With the publishing of Jayant Narlikar's "Was There a Big Bang?" [29] to the more recent book by Eric Lerner titled The Big Bang Never Happened [25] the controversy has accelerated.

The scientific objections to the Big Bang may be summarized as follows:
1. The principle of conservation of angular momentum is violated by the Big Bang theory. The primordial explosion should have propelled all the matter/energy of the cosmos out radially from its center, and by the principle of conservation of angular momentum none of it could have acquired any kind of curvilinear motion, without some additional outside
forces being exerted later. But there are all kinds of curving and orbiting motions of the planets, stars, and galaxies, all held in perfect balance.

2. The universe is not uniform in large scale structure as both the Big Bang and Steady State naturalistic theories require. Furthermore, the background radiation data does not show the variation necessary to explain the huge agglomerations of matter in some regions and vast empty spaces in others, and there are other valid, non Big Bang, explanations for the existence of the background radiation [1].

3. The contradiction of the force of gravity working against the force of the primeval explosion. If the explosion is driving all matter apart in the expanding universe how can we justify the accumulation of matter in any one location such as a star. Gravity, the only force available which is directly related to the amount of matter. The problem is that there is not enough mass available to provide even enough gravity to hold one galaxy together, which has been a problem to the "Big Bang" cosmologists for years. The actual observed mass in the celestial bodies is only one tenth of that required to hold the galactic structures together with their observed angular velocities. This has caused the astronomers to postulate great amounts of cold dark matter and black holes. Einstein himself in 1917, recognizing the problem of the gravitational forces required to hold the system, yet coming up with values that would cause the universe to collapse, added to his equations of general relativity a constant that countered these forces and the result was a universe that was unchanging in all directions. It was only under great pressure from the expanding universe cosmologists that Einstein killed off his cosmological constant.

4. The most serious scientific objection to the Big Bang comes from one of the most basic experimentally verifiable laws of science, namely the second law of thermodynamics. Explosions produce disorder, not order! Every energy transformation process known to man produces disorder and a loss of available energy. How could a primeval chaotic disorder in the first place or the ongoing second law of thermodynamics in the second place have created the the complex ordered universe that we now have?

5. The expanding universe does not correlate with our own solar system with its fixed spatial relationships. Furthermore, the red shift data does not verify Hubble's Law as there are many reasons, as presented, to say that what is being indicated is not recessionary velocity but a combination of effects that would be expected when viewing a polytropic universe in many moving relationships relative to one body and another.

With this well documented demise of the expanding universe theory and the resulting Big Bang theory, we are ready to conclude we indeed are looking at a created "Lumpy" universe. Pictures of Saturn's rings show created structure that could not have been thrown out from some nebular mass nor the planet itself. We have twice landed on Mars and found no life there even though all the elements the evolutionists said it would evolve from were present. Most recently the astronomers have discovered these great clusters of galaxies at various reaches of outer space. These superclusters of thousands of galaxies interrupted by voids estimated to be some 200 to 400 million light years across, have led scientists to conclude that even 20 billion years is not enough time for thousands of galaxies to have clumped together. Recently, two teams of European astronomers have concluded from their observations and calculations that our galaxy contains "no dark matter" [20]. In short, there are no known naturalistic forces available to form such a structured system as our universe.

Coherent Model

It has been shown from science that the elements are a closed finite group found every where the same throughout the cosmos, and that they are not evolving nor can the elements above iron evolve to a more complex element naturally since all of the steps from one to the next are endomorphic, i.e. they require a large amount of energy put in at each step which is not available in any big bang or system which must evolve on its own after the initial energy is supplied. This is entirely consistent with the biblical statement of creation which states that all matter, i.e. the heavens and the earth were created on the first day and energized with the creation of light, i.e. electromagnetic radiation. Furthermore, it is easily shown that all mass and energy must be in perfect balance to sustain the earth in place in its present life supporting role. The requirement that all systems are dependent on each other for this life supporting balance not only lies in the astrodynamics of our solar system but in the biodiversity and interdependence as shown in the
Biosphere 2 experiment, which further proves the statement that "Nothing works until everything works".

In the 1980's the American physicist Alan Guth [18] developed the so-called inflationary theory of the universe to bail out the Big Bang Theory which was shown to violate the conservation of energy at the so-called event horizon by British physicist Stephen Hawking. This inflationary theory which violates all the known laws of physics,[i.e. the first and second law of thermodynamics, and the speed of light] is exactly what the creationist should be saying God did in the short period of four days in which the Scripture declares that He spread out the universe. We do not need to go looking for a change in the speed of light with time as Setterfield has been proposing [26] but merely assert that it was true during the creation event just as Guth has stated. We may work with a four day inflationary model but beyond that the system is not continuing to evolve either in the elemental or astronomical realm. Furthermore, there is no biblical or scientific allowance for either theistic evolution or progressive creation beyond the six days God said He took to make this system a habitation for man [Ex. 31:16,17]. It has been shown that the Bible does not allow for a continually expanding universe, and that the evidence for Hubble's Law and an expanding universe is not in the data we have from space. If any time lapse for stretching out the universe is to be considered it would have to be in the first four days as explained in the biblical analysis. The time and distance problem associated with the so-called vast distances in space may be solved with a God breathed inflationary model or as Humphreys tries with relativity event horizon; or finally, the distances may simply be wrong. With the furthest away objects which can be measured by parallax, i.e. direct measurement, only 250 light years away [17, p.81] and all the indirect measurements such as the red shift and Cepheid-variable method open to serious question, maybe everything does fit within 6000 light years of space.

THE WORLD THAT PERISHED

Biblical Record

In Genesis 2:4-6 we read "This is the history of the heavens and the earth when they were created, in the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens, before any plant of the field was in the earth and before any herb of the field had grown. For the Lord God had not caused it to rain on the earth, and there was no man to till the ground; but a mist went up from the earth and watered the whole face of the ground."

The word translated history is the Hebrew word Toledeth which several scholars say indicates a written history from the time of Adam [40]. Furthermore Genesis 5:1 should read "This is the book [Hebrew sepher] of Adam" so we may propose that the first five chapters of Genesis were written by Adam and passed down to Moses through the Noah-Shem-Heber line.

The word translated mist [Heb. 'edh] in the KJV,ASV, & RSV is translated vapor in the Berkley Version, flood in JB, & NEB, and stream in the NAB in Gen. 2:6. Most versions translate mist in Job 36:27. Based on these two biblical contexts and the Akkadian and Sumerian cognates, edu and A.DE.A respectively, the meanings other than "mist" or "vapor" have been suggested. Earlier translators did not have access to the ancient cuneiform languages which help to determine the meaning of these difficult passages. The Akkadian edu refers to the annual inundation of Babylon by the river Euphrates, and is also used as a term for irrigation [33, pp. 23-34]. It is interesting that the LXX translators used the Greek word for spring in Gen. 2:6. Noting that in Gen. 2:10 it is a river, i.e. not rain, that is watering the garden of Eden, and that the post flood rainbow was a sign, never before seen by Noah, that the world would not be covered completely by water again. It appears that the preflood earth was irrigated by springs and rivers. In Ezekiel chapter 31 the prophet likens the tall cedar in Lebanon to the tall trees of the Garden of Eden, v.9, which he says were watered by "undeground waters" v.4.

Note that the heavens and earth were again referred to as made in a day but God continues to modify and add features throughout the six days as Genesis 2:7 finally brings man into the completed picture who can now care for the plants.
Canopy: It is apparent from the Scripture [Gen. 1:6,7] that the atmosphere above the land was somehow between the waters on the earth and the waters above. This was not only the testimony of Genesis, but of the apostle Peter some 4000 years later as he described the world that perished [II Pet. 3:5]. It is easy to see from our space exploration of the planet Venus that such a canopy could be held in place as we observe a high canopy shrouding that planet with several thousand feet of clear space between the canopy and the ground. The "windows of heaven" [Gen. 7:4] is probably a very accurate description of the canopy breaking up and falling to earth at the start of the Genesis flood. Furthermore, a canopy of high altitude ice crystals is very consistent with the paleontological evidence for giants, lush tropical vegetation et.al., and the Scriptural statements of long life and giants as well.

Pangea... Gen. 2:8-15 describes a land mass configuration which is consistent with many geologist view of the pre continental shift era. The Scripture describes two major land masses adjacent to the garden of Eden. They are called Cush and Havileh and are said to be surrounded by water. The Pangea configuration of Gondwanaland and Laurasia, is described by thirteen plates generated from what is the generally accepted continental drift scenario by todays geologists. Smith,Hurley & Briden's Phanerozoic Paleocontinental World Maps and are the accepted configuration by most geologists [3, p.42]. It is noted that these configurations fit nicely with the biblical description.

Giants... Gen. 6:4 relates that there were giants [Hebrew *nephilim*) in the the earth in those days. With such a uniform testimony from ancient tradition and with paleontological evidence as well [48, p.172] it is consistent with an environment of hyperbaric pressure and warm climates with abundant food sources. It is also clear that the dinosaurs which lived at these times, and especially Leviathan [Gen. 1:21; Job 41; Isa. 27:1] were giant creatures both from the biblical record and the fossil record. Pterosaurs require denser ,i.e. hyperbaric atmosphere, and greater oxygen content for the power to sustain flight with their mass the wing area ratio as several studies have shown. All of this is consistent with a canopy covered earth with the land masses in the temperate and/or tropical zones.

Scientific Evidence

The pre-Flood era is characterized by the fossil record which shows world wide tropical vegetation, and gigantism in both the flora and fauna record [28, pp.336-364].

With regard to the scientific understanding of the pre-Flood water supply it should be understood that no hydrologist would describe the hydrologic cycle of today as the Bible describes the system in Genesis chapter two. In todays hydrologic cycle rainwater falls on a watershed, then drains to streams, thence to the rivers, and eventually to the sea [18]. The system described in Genesis in no way describes such a system.

Coherent Model

The world that perished is generally conceded to be one of lush vegetation, long life, gigantism, and possibly hyperbaric atmosphere [28]. The biblical creationist generally associates this as consistent with a world encircling canopy and lush vegetation over the entire land mass [12,27,28].

It is proposed that the pre-Flood world had a canopy over the world which consisted of ice crystals. This canopy would be set from the beginning so that the biblical statements in Genesis 1:6&7, and II Peter 3:5 would be understood as describing it. The reason it is thought to be ice crystals is twofold: First of all, the vapor canopy as proposed by others [12], gives an insurmountable heat problem when it condenses and returns to the ground at the onset of the Flood [8,p.175]. Secondly, in the case where the land mass is warmest such as the tropic zones, the water vapor rises faster to the stratosphere and the temperature is actually colder at an altitude of 36,000 feet and most of the high altitude clouds are ice crystals such as the noctilucent and nacreous clouds seen today. Brown is mistaken when he calculates an ice canopy as being solid missiles in orbit having to undergo the heat of a object reentering our atmosphere from outer
space [8,p.175], and in fact an ice canopy solves the heating problem of turning into rain at the time of the Flood. It was over 100 years ago that Vail proposed that the precipitation associated with the flood came in as rain in the mid Latitudes and as snow at the poles [38,p.7]. This balance of heating and cooling will have to be the subject of more in depth analysis but certainly the potential of a working model is seen.

In the 1992 Twin-Cities creation conference, and carried through the 1994 International Conference, this author participated in the Flood Model Project. The results of a question regarding the no rain statement of Genesis 2 yielded several concepts. These were: no rain existed up to the flood, no rain up to the fall, no rain only in the Garden of Eden thru the sixth day, no rain through out all the earth up to the sixth day, and no rain on the third day of creation only. It is essential that we come up with a coherent model within the creation community and I believe this paper presents such a model.

The new look which this paper wants to consider is a pangea which does not extend to the poles and possibly a canopy which circulates the rising evaporated moisture back to the water covered poles in the form of snow. This model would not cause it to rain on the land, and no rainbow would be present.

CONCLUSION

In a unique study of modern scientific evidence and biblical exegesis with a normative hermeneutic it is believed that we have constructed a coherent model of natural and biblical history. In several areas the model could be considered new to the standard creationist model, and no attempt was made to come up with extensive naturalistic explanations for the scenario especially when God could have and probably did it supernaturally.

First of all, a finite/bounded universe created by an infinite and unbounded creator was presented. The biblical statements of God's timing and method for putting the universe in place was studied. It was clearly shown that the theories of evolutionary cosmology do not match the the scientific evidence in this space age. Possibilities were presented that dealt with the problem of the apparent great distances in space and time. The complexity, interdependence and balance of the entire cosmos on both a micro and macro scale were reviewed and seen as the only solution possible for the existence of the cosmos is if it were all created in a integrated state. The old adage that "Nothing works until everything works" was shown to be true.

Secondly, a pre-flood scenario was described that fit both the archaeological and physical evidence as well as the biblical record. The model presented was a Pangea with a world wide tropical environment so dear to many paleontologist's and geologist's hearts. Also described was a canopy covered atmosphere and environment which was consistent with long life, gigantism, dinosaurs, heavy flying mammals, and many other probable scenarios of that world that perished. We need to solve the pre-Flood circulation conditions without rain and consistent with a pangea configuration of the land.

In this new and uniquely coherent study of modern science and the biblical record it is hoped that the reader will see a coherent picture of natural history and the Genesis record, and spur the creationists on to some new areas of investigation.
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